

CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (SBN 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
BAS DE BLANK (SBN 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
ALYSSA CARIDIS (SBN 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

SEAN M. SULLIVAN (*pro hac vice*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
MICHAEL P. BOYEA (*pro hac vice*)  
boyea@ls3ip.com  
COLE B. RICHTER (*pro hac vice*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: +1 312 754 0002  
Facsimile: +1 312 754 0003

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

GOOGLE LLC,  
  
Plaintiff and Counterdefendant,  
  
v.  
  
SONOS, INC.,  
  
Defendant and Counterclaimant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA  
Related to Case No. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA

**DECLARATION OF COLE B.  
RICHTER IN SUPPORT OF  
GOOGLE'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO CONSIDER WHETHER  
ANOTHER PARTY'S MATERIAL  
SHOULD BE SEALED (DKT. 537)**

I, Cole B. Richter, declare as follows and would so testify under oath if called upon:

1. I am an attorney with the law firm of Lee Sullivan Shea & Smith LLP, counsel of record to Sonos, Inc. (“Sonos”) in the above-captioned matter. I am a member in good standing of the Bar of the State of Illinois. I have been admitted *pro hac vice* in this matter. I make this declaration based on my personal knowledge, unless otherwise noted. If called, I can and will testify competently to the matters set forth herein.

2. I make this declaration in support of Google’s Administrative Motion to Consider Whether Another Party’s Material Should be Sealed filed on February 28, 2023 (Dkt. 537) (“Administrative Motion to Consider”), in connection with its Reply in Support of Motion for Summary Judgment (“Reply”).

3. Sonos seeks an order sealing the materials as listed below<sup>1</sup>:

Document	Portions Google Sought to Be Filed Under Seal	Portions Sonos Seeks to Be Filed Under Seal	Designating Party <sup>2</sup>
Exhibit 2 to Google’s Reply	Portions outlined in red boxes	The entirety of paragraph 285 which is contained within the portions outlined by Google in red boxes	Sonos

4. I understand that the Ninth Circuit has recognized two different standards that may apply to a request to seal a document, the “compelling reasons” standard and the “good cause” standard. *Blessing v. Plex Sys., Inc.*, No. 21-CV-05951-PJH, 2021 WL 6064006, at \*12 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2021) (citing *Ctr. For Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97 (9th Cir. 2016)). The compelling reasons standard applies to any sealing request made in connection with a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Id.*

<sup>1</sup> Google’s Administrative Motion to Consider also seeks to seal Exhibits 3-5. Sonos’s advises that Exhibits 3-5 do not contain Sonos confidential information and/or material.

<sup>2</sup> It appears Google’s Administrative Motion to Consider contains a typographical error. Google listed the designating party as “Google.” We are responding to this motion as if it intended to indicate “Sonos.”

1 Accordingly, I understand courts in this district apply a “compelling reasons” standard to a  
 2 sealing request made in connection with a motion for summary judgment. *See, e.g., Snapkeys,*  
 3 *Ltd. v. Google LLC*, No. 19-CV-02658-LHK, 2021 WL 1951250, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2021).

4 5. I further understand that confidential technical information about product features,  
 5 architecture, and development satisfies the “compelling reason” standard. *See Delphix Corp. v.*  
 6 *Actifio, Inc.*, No. 13-cv-04613-BLF, 2014 WL 4145520, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Aug. 20, 2014) (finding  
 7 compelling reasons to seal where court filings contained “highly sensitive information regarding  
 8 [an entity’s confidential] product architecture and development”); *Guzik Tech. Enters., Inc. v. W.*  
 9 *Digital Corp.*, No. 5:11-CV-03786-PSG, 2013 WL 6199629, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 27, 2013)  
 10 (sealing exhibit containing “significant references to and discussion regarding the technical  
 11 features” of a litigant’s products). I also understand that courts have found the compelling  
 12 reasons standard satisfied where parties sought to seal “terms” that “if public, could be used by  
 13 both Plaintiff’s and its partners’ competitors to give them an unfair advantage in the development  
 14 and negotiations of rival products.” *Unlockd Media Inc. v. Google LLC*, 21-cv-07250-HSG, at \*2  
 15 (N.D. Cal. Sep. 30, 2022). Under this “compelling reasons” standard, the Court should order the  
 16 above-listed documents sealed.

17 6. Paragraph 285, contained within the portions outlined in a red box by Google, contain  
 18 Sonos’s confidential business information and trade secrets. Specifically, this paragraph lists the  
 19 root and filenames of Sonos’s source code and further identifies where each can be found within  
 20 those files. The specifics of which are confidential information that Sonos does not share  
 21 publicly and is highly sensitive. Thus, public disclosure of such information may lead to  
 22 competitive harm as Sonos’s competitors could use these details regarding Sonos’s source code to  
 23 gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace with respect to their competing products. A less  
 24 restrictive alternative than sealing said documents would not be sufficient because the  
 25 information sought to be sealed is Sonos’s confidential business information and trade secrets and  
 26 Google contends that this information is necessary to Google’s Reply. *See* declaration of Jocelyn  
 27 Ma in support of Google’s administrative motion to seal. Dkt. 536-1, ¶ 4.  
 28

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct to the best of my knowledge. Executed this 7th day of March, 2023 in Chicago, Illinois.

---

COLE B. RICHTER